

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03667 092043Z

54

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 USIE-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-03

ACDA-05 NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

SS-15 NSC-05 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 /056 W

----- 117574

O R 091940Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2643

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T USNATO 3667

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FRG COMMENTS ON US DRAFT OF "ADDITIONAL ASPECTS"  
PAPER ON OPTION III

REF: STATE 156821

1. FRG DELEGATION REP HOYNCK CALLED ON MISSION IN LATE AFTERNOON OF JULY 9 TO PRESENT GERMAN COMMENTS ON THE US DRAFT PAPER (TEXT IN REFTEL) WHICH WAS GIVEN TO THEM AT JULY 4 TRILATERAL. HOYNCK SAID THAT THESE COMMENTS WERE ALSO BEING TRANSMITTED TO GERMAN EMBASSY LONDON TO BE GIVEN TO THE UK AND TO GERMAN MBFR DELEGATION IN VIENNA TO BE GIVEN TO AMBASSADOR RESOR. GERMAN EMBASSY WASHINGTON ALSO RECEIVED A COPY FOR THEIR INFORMATION. WHAT FOLLOWS WAS TRANSLATED BY HOYNCK AS HE WENT ALONG, AND REPRESENTS SUBSTANCE BUT NOT REPEAT NOT PRECISE TEXT OF GERMAN COMMENTS. HOYNCK EMPHASIZED

THESE COMMENTS ARE NOT FINAL.

2. THE SHAPE ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE COMPARED WITH THE US DRAFT  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03667 092043Z

POSITION PAPER. HOYNCK WAS NOT CLEAR WHAT THIS COMMENT MEANT.

3. PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE US DRAFT, WHICH DESCRIBES THE COMMON  
CEILING OBJECTIVE, IS INSUFFICIENTLY PRECISE. MORE DISCUSSION

OF THIS POINT IS NEEDED. THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD CONTAIN A DEFINITION OF WHAT THE PHRASE "APPROPRIATELY DEFINED" IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE MEANS. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HOYNCK EXPLAINED THAT THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD SPELL OUT EXACTLY WHAT WE WOULD WANT THE EAST TO AGREE TO. AGAIN PERSONALLY, HE THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE A GOOD IDEA TO STATE BOTH A MAIMUM OBJECTIVE, WHICH PRESUMABLY WOULD BE EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING AS A PRECISE NUMBER, AND THE MINIMUM WHICH THE WEST WOULD ACCEPT IF THE EAST RESISTED SUCH PRECISION. HOYNCK'S OWN IDEA OF SUCH A MINIMUM POSITION WOULD BE EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE PHRASE "ILLUSTRATIVELY 900,000." HOYNCK BELIEVED THAT THIS WAS AN AREA IN WHICH ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD BE GIVEN SOME FLEXIBILITY. HE EMPHASIZED THAT BONN IS STILL THINKING ABOUT THIS SUBJECT. HE DOES NOT YET HAVE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE "MIGHT/WOULD" QUESTION IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND BELIEVES THAT THE GERMAN POSITION ON THIS MAY DEPEND ON WHAT IS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER.

4. BETWEEN THE SECTIONS "II" OBJECTIVES" AND "III LIMITATIONS" THERE SHOULD BE A SECTION ON "REDUCTIONS". THIS COULD INCORPORATE MUCH OF THE MATERIAL NOW CONTAINED IN THE "LIMITATIONS" SECTION. IT SHOULD COVER THE THREE ELEMENTS WHICH THE US WOULD REDUCE AND SOVIET TANKS. IN CONFORMITY WITH THE SHAPE ASSESSMENT, IT SHOULD CLARIFY WHAT US WARHEADS SHOULD BE REDUCED. COMMENT: WE BELIEVE THIS REFERS TO THE AMBIGUITY OVER WHETHER WARHEADS "AVAILABLE FOR USE BY US UNITS" COULD INCLUDE WARHEADS FORMERLY ASSOCIATED WITH ALLIED SYSTEMS THAT HAVE BEEN PHASED OUT. END COMMENT,

5. THE PAPER SHOULD CLARIFY THE "STRUCTURE OF THE COMBINED COMMON CEILING." COMMENT: THIS APPARENTLY REFERS TO AIR AND GROUND SUBCEILINGS. END COMMENT, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO SPEED UP MBFR WORKING GROUP CONSIDERATION OF THIS ISSUE.

6. PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE US DRAFT PRESUPPOSES A THROUGH DISCUSSION OF THE DIFINITIONS ISSUE, WHICH HAS ALREADY STARTED IN THE SPC.

7. PARAGRAPH 10 OF THE US PAPER REQUIRES MORE SUBSTANCE. OUR POSITION ON US TANK LIMITATIONS MUST TAKE "A CONCRETE FORM."  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03667 092043Z

HOYNCK RECALLED THAT AT THE JULY 4 TRILATERAL TICKELL HAD SAID THAT THE UK WAS WILLING TO KEEP THIS AGREEMENT A TRILATERAL ONE TO AVOID LEAKAGE, BUT THAT A PRECISE TRILATERAL AGREEMENT WAS ESSENTIAL.

8. PARAGRAPH 12 OF THE US DRAFT SHOULD REFER TO PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. IT SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN BOTH PHASES CAN ONLY LIMIT PERSONNEL, AND NOT EQUIPMENT. COMMENT: THIS APPARENTLY MEANS THAT FRG WANTS ALLIANCE AGREEMENT THAT NON-US NATO ARMAMENTS WOULD NOT BE LIMITED AT ALL, EITHER EXPLICITLY OR IMPLICITLY, AS A RESULT OF EITHER REDUCTION OR NON-CIRCUMVENTION AGREEMENTS IN EITHER PHASE. END COMMENT.

9. THERE SHOULD BE A CLEAR AGREEMENT AMONG THE ALLIES THAT NO FURTHER NUCLEAR ELEMENTS WOULD BE REDUCED IN PHASE II. INDEED, IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT THERE WOULD BE NO ADDITIONAL ARMAMENTS IN ALLIED OFFERS IN EITHER PHASE. HOYNCK'S PHRASE WAS "FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE NEGOTIATIONS IS OUT OF THE QUESTION."

10. CLARIFICATION IS NEEDED ON HOW THE ALLIES WOULD DECIDE WHETHER A NEW SOVIET MODEL (HOYNCK WAS UNCLEAR WHETHER THIS MEANT A TANK MODEL, AN AIRCRAFT MODEL, OR BOTH) FALLS INTO OR OUTSIDE OF THE CATEGORY SUBJECT TO LIMITATIONS.

11. FURTHER CLARIFICATION IS NEEDED ON THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE ALLIES MIGHT AGREE TO AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. THE CONDITIONS STATE IN PARAGRAPH 13 OF THE US DRAFT ARE NOT FULLY SATISFACTORY. HOYNCK WAS UNABLE TO STATE WHAT ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS SHOULD BE SET, BUT REFERRED US TO THE MBFR WORKING GROUP PAPER ON THE SUBJECT.

12. THE PHRASE "COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING" WOULD BETTER CLARIFY ALLIED RESISTANCE TO SUBCEILINGS. ON A PERSONAL BASIS HOYNCK CONSIDERED THIS FRG POINT "UNCONVINCING."

13. WE ASKED HOYNCK HOW HE THOUGHT WE SHOULD PROCEED NOW. HE SAID HE HAD NO INSTRUCTIONS, BUT PERSONALLY HE THOUGHT THE US MIGHT WISH TO REVISE ITS DRAFT ON THE BASIS OF THESE COMMENTS (AND UK COMMENTS WHEN WE GET THEM) AND THEN DISCUSS THIS REVISED VERSION AT THE NEXT TRILATERAL MEETING. HOYNCK HOPES  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03667 092043Z

THAT WE CAN GET THE PAPER TABLED IN THE SPC SOON. ONE MORE TRILATERAL SHOULD BE ENOUGH FOR MOST IF NOT ALL OF THE PAPER. HOYNCK STATED WITH GREAT EMPHASIS THAT BONN WILL NOT AGREE TO A GUIDANCE TEXT BEFORE THIS FURTHER "POSITION PAPER" IS FINALIZED. BONN IS OPEN TO SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO PROCEED, BUT HOYNCK HIMSELF WOULD FAVOR TABLING THE ENTIRE TEXT OF THE APER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THE SPC COULD THEN ADDRESS ONE SUBJECT AT A TIME, WORKING THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS OF BOTH THE DRAFT GUIDANCE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER. THIS WOULD AVOID DISCUSSING EACH ISSUE TWICE, ONCE FOR EACH PAPER.  
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 09 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO03667  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzkye.tel  
**Line Count:** 153  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** STATE 156821  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: FRG COMMENTS ON US DRAFT OF "ADDITIONAL ASPECTS" PAPER ON OPTION III  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006